

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-H201-3

Short Proposal Title: Upper Trinity Watershed Stewardship

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The Objectives are not clearly stated. The proposed project appears to have two phases. Phase I appears to be the planning and Phase II will be the implementation of the plan developed in Phase I. The CALFED funding is requested for Phase I.

Phase I of the project is described as “to bring together various stakeholders within the community to develop and implement a comprehensive watershed assessment and Action Plan.” The Expected Products/Outcomes of Phase I (see page 6) do not include implementation. The project proponents may intend to have the GIS task as the “implementation” component. However, it appears from the monitoring component on page 5, that all monitoring analysis will be “pre-implementation” (i.e. No on the ground projects). It is not clear what is being implemented. Finally, page 3, Approach, no task addresses implementation.

Hypotheses are clearly stated in Table 1, page 5. However, there is no additional discussion to help link the hypotheses to the conceptual model.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

It is not clear from the discussion on page 2 “what is” the conceptual model .

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The proposal contains many positive components that will achieve some of the project objectives. However, all project objectives are not addressed by proposed tasks.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

There appears to be solid reasons for preparing the proposed planning documents.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The proposed monitoring and information assessment plans are adequate to assess the outcome of the implemented project. However, the Phase I planning project does not include implementation. Therefore, only pre-implementation project monitoring can be conducted.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No. The proposal calls for the development of Plans for implementation. Two of the five monitoring tasks listed in Table 1 are focused on the changes in sediment/turbidity that may result from on the ground implementation.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The planning efforts proposed are feasible.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The project team appears to be qualified to prepare the planning documents required under the first phase of the proposed project.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	Proposal appears to be in two phases – planning and implementation. This proposal addresses primarily the planning components. However, mixed in are implementation components (e.g. Monitoring for post implementation changes in sediment/turbidity over time). Yet there is no task requiring implementation.